

ADRIAN NEWELL

1. This man is quite unusual. He seems to have taken on Barry Catt's case as the cause of his life. From his initial involvement in approaching various authorities and the police, taking the milk from the fridge, directing the police to potential witnesses, supplying the house for the interviews, taking away the Catt children on the day of the arrest, maintaining voluminous records of the case, being in contact with Thomas almost every day of the current hearing, he has maintained an extraordinary Wizard of Oz like involvement.
2. His commitment to the cause has been strong from the early days. His extraordinary behaviour towards Mr Baggs on the afternoon of 25 August 1989 is eloquent of that (Ex UUUUU para 46, Ex NNNNN para 29). He has, however, shown that he is willing to lie to assist the cause. His out of court claim of presence at Dr Goddard's examination of Barry Catt's wound after the Swan's Crossing incident is an example. Then at this hearing, Sharon Catt revealed that he had phoned her on the morning of the second day she was giving evidence (H 1508). She asked him about something in her statements, knowing that he had a copy (H 1509). Newell later completely denied any discussion of her statements (H 1540). He said that he had phoned her merely to wish her well. However, his explanation for how he knew that she was giving evidence that day was on shifting sands (H 1539).
3. Newell said that he knew from an article in the Sydney Morning Herald (Ex QQQ) that Graham Fellows was to be a witness (H 1000 - 1004). However the only identifying detail there is that the person was a "key figure in the case who does not wish to be named" and that he had "told New South Wales Police he had been assaulted on June 24th by two men and handed a bullet which he was told was custom made for him." (H 1003). Newell said that he knew that Fellows had been assaulted, but nothing about the bullet. When pushed, he then retreated to the fact that other people had come to the same conclusion, and that there may have been other things in the article which led him to believe that. (H 1004). This episode suggests that Newell had knowledge of the case from another source which he did not wish to reveal.
4. Newell showed extraordinary bias against Roseanne Catt in a conversation with Sergeant Boyd-Skinner at his home on 23

January 2003 (H 1996-2001). The fact that there has been no evidence to verify any of the matters raised, despite the time which has passed to allow such enquiries to be made as proposed, points to their entire lack of substance, and Newell's bias and lack of responsibility.

5. As analysed in the paper on the laced liquids, Newell's role in supposedly finding drugs at Barry Catt's home on his first being allowed to return there is highly suspicious. He said at Roseanne Catt's trial that Thomas and Paget were present (T 1244, 1251). It would be quite extraordinary for Newell, given his previous dealings with Thomas about drugs in the drinks, not to have informed Thomas of his discovery. Yet there is no sign that Thomas was informed. At this hearing Thomas could recall no such incident. (H 107).
6. Newell said at this hearing that he did not know Julie Banks (H 907, lines 22, 23). She is the wife of Stephen Foster (H 1159). Foster knew Adrian Newell (H 1163), who called in at his work to see his wife (H 1163).
7. Newell said he did not know James Morris (H 907). Morris said he knew Newell, and thought he came into contact with him about this case. (H 1211).
8. Newell and Barry Catt visited William Ferguson in February 2003 just before the start of this hearing. Ferguson thought Newell was fishing for information. (H 1978).
9. Newell said at Roseanne Catt's trial that he drove Barry Catt to Newcastle for the Family Court hearing on 7 August 1989, and went to the police station in the morning. There, he said he spoke to Thomas and another officer (T 1238). At this hearing, he said that he spoke to "some police officers, and it certainly was not Thomas" (H 968, 26). Again, there is a retreat from his relationship with Thomas.
10. Newell said at Roseanne Catt's trial that he had never had any opportunity "to this day" to interview the Catt children (T 1261). That entirely overlooks that three of them stayed with him and his wife overnight on 24 August 1989. His answer sounds like an automatic defensive position thoughtlessly taken.

11. In defence of his opinion that the sexual assault charges against Barry Catt were baseless, he said that Pam Stein was definitely not a qualified psychologist. Asked how did he know, he said that she admitted it in the Taree Court at Barry Catt's trial (T 1263). In fact she was not a witness at that trial. Another self justifying lie or fancy.
12. Newell gave evidence on behalf of Marie Whalen at her sentencing which according to her is false. (H 2030, 2042).
13. Newell was keen at this hearing to distance himself from Thomas:
"Q. You are not being frank about the level of your involvement with Mr Thomas, are you?
A. I am absolutely. I still to this day do not know Mr Thomas's family, I do not know his home address, I do not know his work premises or address. I have never visited him at any time at his home or had any contact with him for quite some years." (H 1012).

Even Thomas did not go so far:

- "Q. You own a cake shop in the Gold Coast?
A. Factory.
Q. A factory. Have you told that to Barry Catt?
A. I don't know whether I have or I haven't."

* * *

"MARTIN: Q. Had you informed him of that?

- A. I don't recall telling Barry Catt that, but there are numerous people in Taree who are aware that that is the situation, including Adrian Newell.
Q. And, of course, you have been in touch with people in Taree over the years, haven't you?

A. I've got some very close friends in Taree that I do keep in contact with, yes.

Q. And Adrian Newell is one of those?

A. No, Adrian Newell is a person who I have from time to time kept in contact with. But he's not one of the people that I would classify, or I meant when I referred to close friends; close family friends. But Adrian Newell, yeah, certainly has become a friend of mine over the years." (H 469).

Newell's evidence about no contact for quite some years is an outrageous lie in the light of the almost daily phone calls between him and Thomas up to that point in this hearing (26/2/2003). There were also frequent calls in January 2003, and some throughout the preceding several months. (Ex AD, AE). Clearly there is something in the relationship between Newell and Thomas which Newell is anxious to conceal.

Tom Moloney

adriannewell